

## Andrew Jackson, from Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. Edited by John Spencer Bassett.

### JACKSON'S VIEWS ON PROTECTION.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A fragment in his handwriting.

[1828?]<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The reference to the “late Tariff law” seems to indicate the law of 1828. On the other hand, the sentiment expressed is more like Jackson's tariff views of 1824, when he seems to have been turned toward the home market theory by his nationalistic leaning.

The government of England pursues her own policy with a eye single to her own prosperity, and the aggrandisement of her own subjects, she excludes as is acknowledged in the extract bread stuffs, and every other product of our labour, even to the starvation of her subjects, to promote the interest of their own agriculturists; regardless of the injury to other countries—and would not buy a pound of our cotton if she could do without it, and get it of the same quality, and cheaper from other countries; her situation compells her to buy, and she dare not lay a counterracting duty upon our cotton, it would throw it into the marketts of her rivals, and give to them the ascendancy in the cotton manufactories, and prostrate those of England. When we see the politicians of England so sensitive upon the subject of the late Tariff law, it is conclusive evidence to my mind, that the[y] foresee the benefits that must result to America from it, and the injury to Britain, hence as usual their endeavour to alarm us, divide us, and in this way, raise discontent against it, to have it repealed if possible, before its benefits to our country can be discovered by its operation, and hence the exertions of British partizans, about Florence[?] and elsewhere to raise a clamor against it. There was an equal clamour raised in 1816 by the British partizans, against the Tariff then adopted. It was then said, as now, that the south was taxed, for the benefit of a

## Library of Congress

few manufacturers of the north, and the duty imposed upon coarse cottons would ruin the south; what is the fact—one fourth of the amount of all the cotton raised in our country is consumed by the american manufacturers, creating a safe, sane, and permanent home market for the raw material, and the former gets the coarse fabricks of cotton one hundred and one hundred and twenty five percent lower than those fabricated in england and fifty percent better. This is a real saving to the labourer of better than one hundred percent but still this is all wrong because it lessens the price of the British labourer and curtails the profits of the merchant upon his goods, gives profitable employ to our own citizens; but horrid to relate, reduces the price of labour to his British Majesties subjects; creates paupers there, and preserves our own citizens from pauperism. hence the expression and the determination of those under British influence not to buy or use our own fabricks if given to them of better quality; nay, not even cotton bagging altho better and cheaper. Nay, if offered as a compliment. Now I ask [ *incomplete* ]